

09/339,325



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/339,325	06/23/99	SHOHAM	Y 003660.P001X

TM02/0129  
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN  
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD  
7TH FLOOR  
LOS ANGELES CA 90025

EXAMINER

YOUNG, J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2162

4

DATE MAILED: 01/29/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

SM

# Interview Summary

Application No.

09/339,325

Applicant(s)

Shoham et al.

Examiner

John L. Young

Group Art Unit

2162



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) John L. Young

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Carol F. Barry

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Jan 24, 2001Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.Claim(s) discussed: Claim 1.

Identification of prior art discussed:

Franklin 6,055,518.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Discussed proposed amendment of claim 1 to incorporate "bid transformation" and "arbitrary market protocol" elements. The examiner advised Applicant's representative that it appears that there would be no issue of new matter if said elements were incorporated into an amendment of claim 1. However, the examiner advised Applicant's representative that the examiner would have to conduct an update search of the prior art associated with any additional responses from Applicant; furthermore, the examiner could not comment on the patentability of the invention based on the proposed amendment at this time.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

JAMES P. TRAMMELL  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

*JY*  
*1-24-2001*